

01
02
03
04
05
06
07 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
08 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

09 WILLIE L. BURRELL,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 T. TIERNEY, et al.,

13 Defendants.
14 _____

) CASE NO. C09-0922-JLR
)
)
)
) ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
) APPOINT COUNSEL
)
)
)
)

15 Plaintiff submitted a Motion to Appoint Counsel. (Dkt. 5.) Upon the Court's request,
16 plaintiff also submitted an amendment to his motion, containing additional detail as to the
17 nature of and any support for his claims. (Dkt. 7.) Now, having considered plaintiff's
18 motion, the Court finds and concludes as follows:

19 (1) Because plaintiff is a nonprisoner pursuing a civil rights action, the Court
20 considered referring his motion to the Screening Committee of this Court's Pro Bono Panel.
21 However, the Court does not find this matter appropriate for review by the Screening
22 Committee. *See* General Order Governing the Representation of Pro Se Litigants in Civil

01 Rights Actions (W.D. Wash. June 30, 2006).

02 (2) Nor does the Court otherwise find appointment of counsel appropriate in this
03 case. There is no right to appointment of counsel in a civil case. Although the Court, under
04 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), may request counsel to represent a party proceeding *in forma pauperis*,
05 plaintiff has shown neither exceptional circumstances, nor an inability to articulate his claims
06 *pro se* warranting the appointment of counsel. See *Wilborn v. Escalderon*, 789 F.2d 1328,
07 1331 (9th Cir. 1986). Accordingly, plaintiff's application for appointment of counsel is
08 DENIED.

09 (3) The Clerk shall send a copy of this Order to the parties and to the Honorable
10 James L. Robart.

11 DATED this 29th day of September, 2009.

12
13 

14 Mary Alice Theiler
15 United States Magistrate Judge
16
17
18
19
20
21
22